The Review.

Vol. X. St. Louis, Mo., August 6, 1903. No. 31.

CHURCH MUSIC REFORM IN THE EAST.

On June 7th last several church choirs of New York, Brooklyn, and Newark, N. J., respectively, united for the purpose of performing some works by Witt, Haller, Stehle, Thiel, Wiltberger, Ebner, Kothe, and Hillebrand, the latter one of the conductors of the occasion. The performance took place in St. Peter's Church, Newark, N. J., in the presence of Rt. Rev. Bishop O'Connor of the Newark Diocese, Msgr. Doane, several priests, and a large congregation of laymen. The reproduction of the several compositions is reported to have been successful.

Rev. Fr. N. M. Wagner, of Holy Trinity Church, Brooklyn, improved the occasion by delivering a vigorous address, in the course of which he set forth the laws of the Church regarding the use of music in her cult and also uttered a severe but well deserved indictment against those who ignore or violate the laws and wishes of our Holy Church. He showed that the quality of the music performed in the vast majority of churches in New York and vicinity is not only unliturgical, but also devoid of artistic value. Father Wagner names those whose compositions dominate most organ lofts in the Metropolis, among them Wiegand, Lambillotte, Millard, Giorza, Diabelli, Dachauer, La Hache, Mercadante, Farmer, Stearn. He might have added many other names such as Rev. Ganss, who in particular has done unspeakable harm with his trivial and frivolous musical settings of sacred texts.

Nothing which Father Wagner said in his sermon, no matter how severe, adequately expresses the nausea and disgust a musician worthy of the name experiences on hearing the frivolities and inanities by Millard, Giorza, Ganss, Marzo, and all the others. If a program consisting of works by the above mentioned so-called composers were to be performed before an audience such as usually attends the New York Philharmonic concerts, or

the performances of the New York "Oratorio Society," the audience would either demand its money back or laugh the perpetrators off the stage. And that which is too insignificant, silly, and frivolous to be performed in a respectable concert hall (I defy anybody to prove that a composition by any of the above named composers has been performed at a first-class concert in New York) is year in and year out produced before the Blessed Sacrament in some of the most prominent churches in the Metropolis.

It is therefore gratifying to hear that priests are beginning to raise their voice in protest against the shameful or rather shameless invasion of the sanctuary by pseudo-musicians, who not only throw liturgical regulations to the wind, but whose elucubrations have absolutely no artistic *raison d'être.*

It has been pointed out before in THE REVIEW that, if we except a few German churches and St. Francis Xavier's in 16th Str., the best and only place in New York to hear the great masters of Church or Cecilian music properly performed is Carnegie Music Hall on some evening when the Musical Art Society—composed mostly of Protestants and conducted by a Hebrew—gives one of its concerts. Excluded from the sanctuary which gave them being and for which they were destined,—by the indifference, ignorance, and neglect of those in authority, the immortal works by Palestrina, Lassus, Gabrieli, Lotti, Croce, and others find adequate interpretation at the hands of aliens in a secular temple of art. Is it not high time that the traffic in meretricious vulgarity be banished from our churches and that heed be given to the many, many decrees on the matter of Church music issued by the Holy See?

JOSEPH OTTEN.

SHOULD LABOR UNIONS INCORPORATE?

In view of the many recent proceedings against trade unions by way of injunctions and suits for damages, the National Civic Federation addressed enquiries to a number of representative men, asking for a statement of opinion regarding the proper course for trade unions to take in the matter of incorporation. Attention was called to the Taff Vale decision in Great Britain and to several cases in the U. S., where members of unincorporated unions have been held personally responsible for damages and costs of prosecution. The question was asked whether, in defending such suits, the unions would be placed in a better or in a worse position if they were incorporated, than they are at present when unincorporated. Enquiry was also made as to whether a special law should be enacted for the incorporation of

unions, differing from the law for business corporations, and if so, what should be its terms.

The answers were published in the monthly bulletin of the National Civic Federation. Although they are all very interesting, space does not permit us to give more than a synopsis. The reader will readily understand that with such a discrepancy of views, it is next to impossible to frame a law, national or State, settling the above query to general satisfaction.

With the apparently increasing power of trade unions it is to be expected that a demand should arise for their proportionate responsibility. The grounds of this demand vary, but they usually turn on different meanings of the word responsibility. Some advocate incorporation, in order to hold the unions responsible for violation of contracts; others do so with the intention of fixing responsibility on them for unlawful acts—known legally as "torts." The latter group is again to be subdivided accordingly as the members have in mind the acts of different parties in varying conditions—some contemplating the acts of officers and members authorized by the union; others the acts of members unauthorized by the union; and still others the acts of sympathizers not members and not authorized by the union.

Certain of the legal contributors to the symposium hold that for illegal acts—"torts"—such as trespass, intimidation, boycott, violence, etc., authorized by the unions or their officers, the unions can already, even though not incorporated, be held legally responsible to the extent of their treasuries, and also that each member of a union can be held legally responsible to the extent of his private estate. They also hold that the incorporation of the union would not relieve the individual member of legal responsibility for illegal acts. Incorporation "would not in the least protect individual leaders and members from being 'joined' as defendants in suits for damages for conspiracies and other 'torts.'" Incorporation "will not relieve the individual members of the corporation from responsibility likewise." According to these views, incorporation of a union would not increase its responsibility for illegal acts of its members.

One of the employers, however, seems to hold that by incorporation the union could be held for illegal acts done by sympathizers in the prosecution of a strike. Other contributors hold exactly the opposite view, that incorporation would relieve the union of liability for damages inflicted in its interests, and the only answer received from an incorporated union cites this as the main advantage gained by incorporation. Extending responsibility of a corporation to cover the unauthorized acts either of members or non-members, does not seem to be advocated by the legal writers,

and they hold that an unincorporated union would not be held in damages for the unlawful acts of members or non-members committed in sympathy with the union's cause, but without authorization from the union or its officers. This does not apply to the acts of officers themselves, since their acts are held to be those of the union. One employer holds that what society and employers want is not damages from unions for injuries unlawfully inflicted, but restraint from committing these unlawful acts, and this, he says, can be had through the injunction.

The other kind of responsibility is for violation of contracts. Those who desire it hold that employers can not enter on contracts with unions on fair terms, because, while the employer is financially and legally responsible, the union is only morally responsible. Here, again, two very different kinds of responsibility are in view. The one responsibility is for individual members, the other for joint action of all the members. One contributor seems to maintain that the union should be held financially liable for a violation of contract by a member who, for example, leaves his work without consent of his employer. This would seem to be a kind of responsibility which very few unions would care to assume, and it is a misapprehension of the whole nature of a union agreement with employers. By such an agreement the union would become a contractor to farm out labor. Certain unions, such as the Garment Workers and the Longshoremen, agree to furnish what labor is required by the employer, but they relieve themselves of the usual responsibility of a contractor by a proviso that the employer may hire non-members if the union can not supply the force required. But this class of union contracts is exceptional. Union agreements are not contracts to furnish labor; each laborer makes his own labor contract directly with his employer. The union agreement is simply an understanding by which the parties represented agree to make similar contracts respecting hours, wages, and work. The employer enforces his side of the agreement through his right to discharge the workman, and the union enforces its side by its right to strike. One employer fears that should the unions thus become contractors to farm out labor, as do the Chinese companies, their greatly increased power would be productive of more harm than good, and would not tend to improve the character of the working men; and, on the other hand, if they should not become contractors for labor, their responsibility could be easily evaded, even though they were incorporated.

Other contributors hold the customary view that the union should be held responsible only for the joint action of its members, such as a stoppage of work by a strike, or the support of a

member who violates his agreement. Here the question arises. Would incorporation of unions lessen the number of strikes in violation of agreements not to strike? Answering this in the affirmative, several writers refer to the probable added feeling of responsibility on the part of leaders and members which would come through incorporation. Others, replying in the negative, point out the very small funds in the union treasuries. But more generally it is held that incorporation is not necessary in order to promote the observance of contracts. Several union representatives assert that unions do not violate their agreements and that only employers do. Others do not go so far. One employer, a prominent member of the National Founders and the Stove Founders' Association, argues that where employers free themselves of sentimental opposition to trade unions and then deal with their agents on a business basis, the unions are in a better position to be held accountable. Other contributors strongly urge that the trade agreement is the proper substitute for incorporation. A statistician asserts that nearly all violations occur in the field of agreements with individual employers, and that there have been very few violations of trade agreements made between associations of employers and associations of workmen. Certain union representatives admit the lack of discipline within some unions, but hold that all are gradually being educated to higher standards and that this education will be the more rapid as employers show a greater willingness to make and observe agreements.

Supposing it is not necessary to have incorporation in order to compel unions to abide by their contracts, the converse proposition is presented by a union representative, who contends that unions, even if incorporated, can not secure damages from employers who violate their contracts with the unions. Referring to the experience of the Garment Workers, who have brought suits on bonds given by employers, he argues that the employer can raise in defense the plea of duress, since he was compelled, in view of the alternative of seeing his business ruined, to agree to the terms laid down by the unions. On the other hand, a representative of another branch of the clothing industry, whose union is incorporated, states that the legality of their contracts has been sustained in the courts; but a former counsel of this union thinks the union would have fared better if it had given up its corporate organization.

Among the objections raised to incorporation by the unions is, of course, first of all, the liability of exposing their treasuries to attack. But if the trend of legal answers is correct, as stated, these treasuries are already liable for unlawful acts even without incor-

poration, and there is even an intimation that they are also liable for violation of contract.

If this be true, the danger which the unions may meet through incorporation must be found elsewhere. Several writers contend that the real danger lies in the internal affairs of the union. The union must have almost arbitrary control over its members in the way of discipline, and were it incorporated, its constitution and by-laws would be subject to judicial enquiry, and it would be continually in court on suits brought by dissatisfied or expelled members, oftentimes instigated by employers. It is pointed out that the New York Stock Exchange, under advice of the ablest legal talent, avoids incorporation in order that it may enfore complete discipline upon its members without interference by the courts.

Some of the writers fear also that judicial interference would operate against the democratic character of union management, would do away with the initiative and referendum and would make the directors and officers powerful and oligarchic. This result would stand in the way of growth in membership, which would be unfortunate both to the unions and to society. To incorporate the unions would drive them into politics and a crude form of Socialism.

There is a curious contrast in the opinions regarding the attitude of the courts. The union spokesmen in general speak of the hostility of the courts to unions and their bias towards the employers, mentioning the interstate commerce and anti-trust laws as having been perverted from their original object to the injury of unions. Yet some of the employers speak of the whole machinery of justice in our State courts as paralyzed by fear of the union vote. Not more law is needed, they say, but more honest and courageous enforcement of the laws as they are, and incorporation would not add responsibility, since prosecuting attorneys, judges, and juries would, through their sympathies with the unions, temper the laws even more than now.

Other contributors, while not emphasizing the attitude of the courts toward either side, believe that their tedious processes place the unions at a disadvantage. At present there is a disparity between the treasuries of unions and corporations, the latter having an unlimited call on high-priced legal counsel.

Of those who answer the question as to the need of a special law for the incorporation of unions, the legal writers all agree that such a law is necessary, but there is only one writer who offers suggestions as to its necessary provisions. One union officer would have the benefit funds separated from the other funds and would have the union exempt from responsibility for the personal acts of members in violation of law. It is pointed out that

the federal law providing for the incorporation of unions exempts members as well as the corporation itself from liability for "the acts of members or others in violation of law." Other contributors think it would be difficult and even impossible to frame a special law making the union responsible for authorized acts and not responsible for unauthorized acts.

Compulsory incorporation is rejected by all who refer to it, one legal writer pointing out that it would be equivalent to prohibiting workmen from enjoying the liberty of the citizen, the freedom of contract, and the right of free assembly.

Finally, several union representatives dismiss the whole subject by boldly asserting that, whatever the arguments presented, the unions *will not* incorporate. This assertion is hardly vital, since it is conceivable that a special law could be so framed that the unions would choose incorporation as an alternative to increasingly drastic decisions against them when not incorporated. One writer suggests that under a compulsory arbitration law, like those of New Zealand and Australia, the unions would find a decided advantage in incorporation.

* * *

The symposium as a whole seems to indicate that the customary arguments for and against incorporation of unions are invalid, since they turn on the responsibility of unions for unlawful acts. Incorporation would not increase or decrease their responsibility in this respect. Both the treasury of the union and the property of the members are liable in damages on account of such acts, whether the union is incorporated or unincorporated.

As regards the enforcement of contracts, the opinions in the symposium are at wide variance, both from the standpoint of the union in enforcing the agreement upon employers and from the standpoint of employers in enforcing the agreement upon the workmen. That existing laws governing corporations are not adapted to the needs of labor unions, is generally admitted in the suggestion that special laws should be enacted for the purpose.

℘ ℘ ℘

What Ails France?—Thirty years ago Mme. Julie Lavergne pungently put it thus: "Fire broke out in the room of a drunkard, who opened the window and cried for help. The neighbors came running with buckets full of water. 'Stand back,' he cried, 'I am afraid of water. Bring me wine or whiskey, or I won't open.' And he barricaded his door and perished in the flames. Frenchmen, you, who pretend to end the Revolution by riding its principles, do not laugh at this drunkard."—Correspondence of Julie Lavergne, letter of Oct. 24th, 1873.

AN IMPORTANT NEW BOOK ON EDUCATION.*)

With hardly an exception, our American and English non-Catholic books on education give more or less a caricature of Jesuit education. What wonder, then, that our educators rarely display correct ideas of this educational system? Unluckily they are confirmed in their preconceived notions by a well-known French author, whose work is translated into English and very extensively used in this country. It is true, Rev. Thos. Hughes, S. J., had written his 'Loyola and the Educational System of the Jesuits' for the 'Great Educators Series,' published by the Scribners. But could not the bold and very positive statements of other writers be correct in spite of Father Hughes' praise of the Order's school system? Illogical as this position might be, the opponents did not admit themselves refuted.

Nothing, therefore, could be more timely than a book on Jesuit education from the pen of a Jesuit, which would add to an explanation a direct refutation of the numerous objections made against the much maligned system. Father Schwickerath's work, in which this task was undertaken, lies before us, and after a careful perusal we gladly give it unreserved praise. The writer has done his work thoroughly, after long and careful studies; and as he has won for himself a place among authorities on education, he has made it impossible for all fair-minded educators to repeat in future from Compayré, Painter, or Seeley, the many misrepresentations of the Jesuit educational system. With a book like this in the market, President Eliot would certainly not have followed blindly in his ill-timed utterances on Jesuit education, authors of whom some are here proved to have been inspired by direct enmity (p. 11) to distort the Jesuit system, and thereby to have forfitted their right to be regarded as trustworthy authorities (pp. 649 sqq.)

Father Schwickerath gives us a powerful apologia of the Jesuit system both as a whole and in every one of its leading features; and this from the double standpoint of an earnest and learned student of theoretical education, and a practical schoolman.

It will be impossible to give an exhaustive account of the many questions discussed in each chapter. The student of the history of education will find much new material in the first part, "History of Jesuit Education." After reviewing the school systems in vogue in various countries at the close of the Middle Ages, the author briefly characterizes medieval education; then follows a survey

---

*) Jesuit Education, its History and Principles Viewed in the Light of Modern Educational Problems, by R. Schwickerath, S. J., Woodstock College, Md. (XVI. and 687 pp.) B. Herder, St. Louis. Price $1.75 net. The book is neatly printed and bound and presents a very attractive appearance.

of the influence of the Reformation on education. One more general chapter on religious as educators, and we have the whole broad ground surveyed on which the Jesuit system was built up. Being an offshoot of the then prevalent systems,—and not merely a copy of the Protestant schools, as P. Schwickerath successfully and convincingly proves (pp. 140-141),—it soon began its independent career, which led in a short time to the first "Ratio studiorum," that of 1599.

That neither this "Ratio," nor the second of 1832, which is discussed in the sixth chapter, had a narrowing influence on the Jesuit teachers, is demonstrated by an extensive history of Jesuit colleges and Jesuit writers. With great delight we read the paragraphs where the men who are said to have become narrow by a classical system including little else than Latin and Greek, are shown to have been (pp. 148 sqq. 226 sqq.) able competitors at least, if not the leaders, in all branches of learning; including in the earlier times geography and history as well as the study of the mother tongue, and last but not least mathematics and sciences: and in the nineteenth century the various branches of modern learning (p. 124 sqq., 198-199).

After this minute research Father Schwickerath easily refutes the many charges of his opponents (esp. pp. 223 sqq., 243 sqq.)

Not every thing that had to be discussed in the first part is new to educators. But certainly new and interesting is the manner in which these questions are discussed. Starting from the opponent's view, which is given in full, our author offers us the unique spectacle of seeing the enemy refuted by more able enemies, or at least by men who have no special sympathy for the Jesuits. He then compares the Jesuit system with the school systems of countries that are recognized leaders in education. Finally he adds his own refutations, characterized by keen logical reasoning.

A most powerful weapon in the hands of our author is the comparison between the Jesuit and the German school system and the continual quotations from German authorities. These arguments must go far to convince American educators, for whom up to the present day Nägelsbach, Paulsen, Ziegler, Schiller, etc., were the oracles on education, for whom works like Schmid's 'Geschichte der Erziehung,' Baumeister's 'Handbuch der Erziehungs- und Unterrichtslehre für höhere Schulen,' Kehrbach's 'Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica,' and similar work were the true sources of educational wisdom, and for whom Germany is still the classical land of genuine education. Both sarcastic and convincing then is Father Schwickerath's question (p. 10), whether or not President Eliot would have dared to tell in his charges

against the Jesuits system, that it is essentially the same as the official system of Prussia, where, after a short trial of the reform of studies advocated by Eliot, the old system was rëenforced (pp. 280-291.)

The second part, "Principles of the Ratio Studiorum," is abundantly rich in the discussion of the educational problems of all times, but especially of those that are now most hotly agitated. From the vast Jesuit literature which the writer masters to an astonishing extent, he shows the soundness of the Society's standpoint with regard to the elective system, the question of expurgated editions, coeducation, etc.

Undoubtedly the best chapter of the book is the sixteenth on "The Method of Teaching in Practice."

What Father Schwickerath has to say in the seventeenth and eighteenth chapters on the moral and religious scope of every true, and in particular of the Jesuit, educational system, should be earnestly considered by every teacher. For Catholics his standpoint is the only true one, and it were nothing less than treason to immortal souls to follow the modern educational systems in their utter neglect of a moral training based on religion.

The twentieth chapter we may sum up by saying that the Jesuit as teacher strives always to imitate as perfectly as possible Jesus Christ, the master-teacher.

We are sure, then, that the reader will agree with us that Father Schwickerath's book will prove a strong weapon in the hands of Catholic priests and teachers against false educational theories. It is more than a defence of Jesuit education; above all it is a victorious refutation of the many false statements of men like Compayré, Painter, Payne, and Seeley. We therefore recommend the book especially to all the Catholic school teachers who were taught in our State Normal Schools on the authority of the above named authors. We assure every truth-loving non-Catholic teacher that the author defends the system of his Order as a gentleman and a scholar. He tries to convince you, and aims at nothing else. There is nothing that will not make it a pleasure for the reader to follow him from assertion to assertion till the end of the book, where he gives a conspectus of his principal and auxiliary sources, including among the latter, we are pleased to note, our own humble REVIEW.

THE C. M. B. A. ONCE MORE.

Under the heading: "Clergy Please Take Notice," Chas. L. Brown publishes in the official organ of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association, the *C. M. B. A. News*, for July, 1903, an article which is intended as a reply to our comments on the business methods of that organization, and which is promptly reprinted in the *Denver Catholic* (July 11th), that self-constituted champion of the concern referred to. We can not for lack of space, reproduce this strange amalgam of abuse of our journal, misstatement of facts, and error in figures, especially as it is not an official statement of the C. M. B. A., but simply an effort of some well-meaning friend of the society to defend it against our charges. In justice to the readers of our previous remarks we will, for the last time, refute the misrepresentations made on behalf of this society, and correct some of Mr. Brown's misleading figures.

To enlighten our alleged ignorance of the "true condition" of the C. B. M. A., Mr. Brown informs us that the society has 216 branches "within the Grand Council of Pennsylvania." That they do not figure in the official insurance reports of that State, he "explains" as follows:

"The C. M. B. A. was licensed to do business in Michigan and Pennsylvania before laws were enacted calling for these reports, consequently the society is exempt from making a report except to the insurance commissioner of New York."

We submitted this claim to the State Insurance Department of Pennsylvania and give its reply, dated July 15th, 1903, verbatim:

"Replying to yours of the 14th inst. permit me to say that the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of New York *is not now and never has been registered* in this office, *or authorized to transact business in this State.*

"The Association *can not legally transact business* in Pennsylvania without being registered or having a license from this Department, and until it is licensed and the proper person designated as its attorney for service of process, *a member can not bring suit against the Association in this State*, but would have to go to the home office of the company in order to commence or maintain any legal proceedings against the Association.

Respectfully,
(Signed) ISRAEL W. DURHAM,
Insurance Commissioner."

It follows that if the C. M. B. A. has any members in the State of Pennsylvania, it is doing business there in direct disregard and violation of the laws of the Commonwealth, and such members have no standing in any court of Pennsylvania, but must go to New York State for justice, if in need of legal action against the corporation.

Mr. Brown charges THE REVIEW with "taking particular pride in trying to shatter the hopes of mutual or co-operative societies,"

and says that it "in every instance in its vaunting way lauds Old Line." He informs us that, "out of 822 old line companies chartered to do business in the United States, 725 are out of business." Mr. Brown does not tell us where he found these figures, but we assert on the basis of official returns (insurance reports) that of all the mutual life insurance companies ever chartered on the old line basis in the United States, not one ever failed, but all are still doing business, and refer him to our article of April 2nd (No. 13) of this years' REVIEW, where we have given a partial list and a comparison of their expenses with those of Catholic mutual societies, unfortunately not to the advantage of the latter.

Passing over some unimportant claims equally incorrect, we now come to Mr. Brown's table, alleged to give the nonparticipating rates of the Mutual Life. Mr. Brown takes the liberty of deducting 20% from said rates, "to procure the net premium."

But there is no loading of 20% on non-participating rates, and any old line company doing business on the basis of Mr. Brown's figures would promptly be stopped from issuing policies by the State insurance authorities. 'Flitchcraft's Manual,' a standard insurance publication, gives the net annual premiums for the various ages based on the American Table of Mortality, with reserve accumulations earning 4% interest annually, and reaching face of policy age 96, (a very liberal allowance), but without provision for expenses.

To illustrate how unreliable Mr. Brown's way of figuring is, we give below in the first column the net annual premium required according to standard authorities for a straight life policy at ages quoted in his article, (4% American experience); next the *de facto* rates of the Mutual Life, then Mr. Brown's alleged rates, and last the charges of the C. M. B. A. according to Mr. Brown's statement. We do not know whether he has quoted the C. M. B. A. rates correctly, but if so, the rates are much too low for safety.

AGE.	STANDARD NET PREMIUM.	MUTUAL LIFE RATE.	MR. BROWN'S M. L. RATE.	C. M. B. A.
20	$12.67	$15.01	$12.00	$ 4.50
25	14.21	16.46	13.17	5.10
30	16.21	18.74	15.00	6.50
35	18.84	21.70	17.36	7.25
40	22.35	25.62	20.50	9.00
45	27.12	30.90	24.72	10.50
49	32.21	36.49	29.20	(50) 12.00

Since the "net premiums" in the first column are the money required for paying death losses and accumulating the needed reserve, with 4% interest income, to have $1,000 in bank at age 96, without making allowance for expenses, it is easy to see how far short the C. M. B. A.'s rates are.

Mr. Brown says: "The membership of this society has been

taught that the cost will not increase." We believe this to be one of the few true claims made in his article, and it is the very reason why THE REVIEW has labored for years past to convince the managers and members of this and other Catholic mutuals of the necessity of studying the subject before misleading still more Catholic men in the vain hope that getting "new blood" will insure permanency for companies which are conducted on a false basis.

In conclusion let us quote once more the result of the two years' investigation made by the Revision Committee of the Catholic Order of Foresters and published on May 1st of this year:

"Two things were . . . . shown to the satisfaction of the Committee by the history of fraternal organizations on their insurance or protection side, namely:

"1. That, notwithstanding oft repeated assertions and opinions of many advocates, that rates once in vogue were high enough to mature their contracts, the course of short time proved that they were not; and

"2. As far as the history of insurance goes, that any and all plans which failed to provide for payment in advance yearly or monthly, of a sufficient sum, which, properly invested and increased, would accumulate enough to meet the contracts when due, failed in their final outcome."

So will the plan of the C. M. B. A. fail in its final outcome, unless its managers silence the Browns and disavow the *Denver Catholics*, and undertake the by no means easy task of reconstructing their financial system.

"*Qui vivra verra!*"

RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF THE THIRD AND FOURTH DEGREE IN AMERICAN FREEMASONRY.

The third or master's degree is interesting on account of its religious symbolism. It is intended to teach the Masonic resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul. This is certainly adding to the Mason's creed, which, we were told explicitly, required only a belief in a deity (p. 44). However, as the candidate has already advanced in the Masonic life and is anxious for higher degrees, he is not going to be particular about Masonic consistency.

"It was," says Mackey's Ritualist, p. 109, "the single object of all the ancient rites and mysteries practised in the very bosom of pagan darkness, shining as a solitary beacon in all that surrounding gloom and cheering the philosopher in his weary pilgrimage of life, to teach the immortality of the soul. This is still the great design of the third degree of Masonry. This is the scope and

aim of its ritual.... The important design of the degree is to symbolize the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul."

We may be excused for refusing to receive on the unproved assertion of our author that the teaching of the immortality of the soul was the single object of the ancient pagan rites and mysteries. The researches of the learned attribute, and justly so, quite other objects to them. For us it suffices that the degree typifies religious truths, or the parodies of religious truths; for Masonic resurrection is as different from Christian as Masonry is from Christianity.

In view, therefore, of the claims and the religious nature of Masonry we can better appreciate the hymn that is sung in the lodges:

"Hail Masonry divine!
Glory of ages shine,
Long may'st thou reign;
Where'er thy lodges stand,
May they have great command,
And always grace the land,
Thou art divine."

There isn't much of the tone of a "handmaid" in the hymn—"Long may'st thou reign"—"May they have great command"—but we think that the theory of the handmaid has been long since shattered.

From another hymn, on p. 219 of the Ritualist, we copy the opening and closing stanzas:

"Hail universal Lord,
By heaven and earth adored,
All hail, great God!
Before thy throne we bend,
To us thy grace extend,
And to our prayer attend;
All hail, great God!
.....
To thee our hearts do draw,
On them, O write thy law,
Our Saviour God!
When in this Lodge we're met
And at thy altar set,
O do not us forget,
Our Saviour God!"

The fourth degree, or that of Mark Master, contains an interesting charge to the candidate, which, "with slight but necessary modifications," as the Ritualist tells us, "is taken from the 2nd chapter of the 1st Epistle of Peter and the 28th chapter of Isaiah."

The words of St. Peter are the interpretation of the words of the prophet and are explicitly applied to Christ. Permit me first

to quote the charge and then to note "the slight but necessary modification."

"If it be that ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious, to whom coming as unto a living stone, be ye built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood to offer up sacrifices acceptable to God" (p. 271).

In such shape does Masonry deck itself out in the borrowed robes of Christianity to deceive the unwary! But St. Peter was too sectarian for Masonry and hence the slight but necessary change. We quote the passage from the Vulgate:

"If so be you have tasted that the Lord is sweet. Unto whom coming as to a living stone, rejected indeed by men, but chosen and made honorable by God: Be you also as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God *by Jesus Christ*" (1. Pet. II, 3, 4, 5.) The slight but necessary change was to take out the whole pith of the passage, that thus mutilated it might fit Masonry. The living stone, according to St. Peter, is Jesus Christ, rejected indeed by men but chosen and made honorable by God. In Him, as living stones, are we to be built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God. Masonry, which omitted all mention of Jesus Christ, omitted also, as a trivial matter, the word "spiritual" before sacrifices. "Wherefore," says the Apostle, "it is said in Scripture.....The stone which the builders rejected, the same is made the head of the corner" (ibid., 6, 8.) Masonry rejects Christ, as we have proved by its fundamental principles and as the present and other instances show; but have we ever reflected how characteristically both St. Peter and Isaiah have described its votaries, the one calling them men; the other, builders? The idol of Masonry is humanity in the strong, healthy, physical man. Such is its type and the standard of its perfection. And what does "Mason" mean but "builder"? These builders, these men (for only the male sex can be Masons) these men whose aspirations are limited to humanity, reject Christ as the corner-stone of their lives to substitute what at present we dare not breathe.

LEO XIII. AND THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR.

We read in the N. Y. *Evening Post* of July 31st:

One of Leo XIII.'s attempted services to humanity was his endeavor to avert the Spanish-American war. New and illuminating details of his efforts on that occasion are given in an article published in the *Revue Historique* for July-August. The writer, A. Viallate, has had access to Spanish diplomatic correspondence, and clearly brings out certain facts only suspected before, and not at all disclosed in the official publications of our own govern-

ment. For example, on April 2d, 1898, the Spanish Minister to the Vatican telegraphed to the Minister of Foreign Affairs at Madrid that he had just had a call from Cardinal Rampolla. In behalf of the Holy Father, the Cardinal said:

"The news received from the United States is very alarming. The President is desirous of adjusting the controversy, but he is dragged along [*entrainé*] by Congress. The difficulty is to find some one who may request the suspension of hostilities. The President appears strongly disposed to accept the aid of the Pope."

His Holiness thereupon asked if his intervention would be acceptable to Spain. The reply was favorable, and the result was that moving offer of the Queen Regent, "at the request of the Holy Father," to "proclaim an immediate and unconditional suspension of hostilities in the island of Cuba." This was telegraphed by Minister Woodford direct to President McKinley on April 5th, 1898, but the latter was by that time so much further dragged along by Congress that he did not even mention the critical despatch, nor was it deemed prudent to publish it at all until after the lapse of three years.

The claim was set up that this government had not really desired the good offices of the Pope. Another of M. Viallate's despatches, however, shows how close it came to asking papal intervention. On April 4th the Spanish Minister in the United States telegraphed that he had just had an interview with Archbishop Ireland. That prelate had come to Washington "on the orders of the Pope." He had seen the President twice, who "ardently desired peace," but was afraid that Congress would vote war, which the helpless man would finally be obliged to yield (*céder*). A final effort must be made, etc. All of which should somehow be commemorated in the McKinley monument. We suggest a bas-relief showing the President dragged along by Congress into a war from which he shrank, and which he might have prevented.

* * *

Peonage.—The Georgia legislature has adopted a resolution which provides for a legislative investigation into the charges of negro peonage in that State, and which declares:

"That a system of peonage is practiced in this Commonwealth, persons male and female being held in bondage in violation of the legislation, State and national, contrary to a healthy public sentiment and injurious to the body politic as well as grossly wronging and outraging those unlawfully held."

A similar state of affairs seems to exist in Alabama. The white population of these two States is overwhelmingly native, the so-called "foreign" element being hardly represented there. Are these conditions samples of the "American civilization" which according to the political leaders of this nation should be the standard for the whole world?